

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-24 and rejected same. With this paper, no claims are canceled, and no new claims are added, so claims 1-24 remain in the application.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At section 2 of the Office action, claims 1-9, 13-18 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kukkohovi (US 6,119,003).

The invention is provided to make it easier for a person using a first communication device to reach another person using a second communication device where the two devices are each capable of communicating by more than one bearer/ communication technology. With the invention, the first communication device obtains association information indicating the different possible bearers that can be used to reach the second communication device. All of the independent claims (i.e. claims 1, 13, 15 and 20) are amended by this paper to make express that the association information providing alternative bearers by which the second device can be reached is obtained from a contacts bearer data store in which bearers are arranged by contact. Support is provided at e.g. page 6, line 24 to page 7, line 6.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kukkohovi does not teach obtaining association information as in claim 1, as amended. Kukkohovi addresses the problem of how to transparently transfer from one network to another always trying to arrange for a connection via a favored network (even during a call). Such a transfer can be before or during a conversation. Kukkohovi discloses that the networks (different bearers) can be arranged in an ordered or prioritized list that is stored in the terminal. However, Kukkohovi nowhere discloses or suggests obtaining association information from a contacts data store where different possible bearers are provided arranged by contact, i.e. for each

contact a list of possible bearers is provided. Thus, Kukkohovi does not provide the functionality of the invention as in the independent claims, since the association information per the independent claims is on a per contact/ user basis, and not the same for all contacts/ users.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

At section 4 5 of the Office action, claims 10-12, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kukkohovi in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0243684 to Ha et al.

On at least the ground that all the claims rejected under 35 USC §103 depend from one or another of the independent claims all believed allowable as set out above, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,

July 12, 2005

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James A. Retter  
Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234  
Cust. No.: 004955